UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/682,094 | 10/09/2003 | Poul Bach | 10313.200-US | 9214 | |
| 25908 NOVOZYME | 7590 04/02/201 S NORTH AMERICA. | EXAMINER | | | |
| 500 FIFTH AVENUE | | | METZMAIER, DANIEL S | | |
| SUITE 1600 NEW YORK, NY 10110 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| Toma Toma Toma | | | 1796 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 04/02/2010 | EI ECTRONIC | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Patents-US-NY@novozymes.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--------------|--|--|
| | 10/682,094 | BACH ET AL. | | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| | Daniel S. Metzmaier | 1796 | | |

| | Daniel S. Metzmaier | 1796 | |
|---|--|--|----------------------------------|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 18 March 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP | PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR | ALLOWANCE. | |
| M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must limely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appendors for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(| ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection | n. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 | | |
| have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set of th in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat | nally set in the final Office | e action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be | filed within two months | s of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t | | | cause |
| (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further core (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | | E below); | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett | | ducina or simplifyina tl | ne issues for |
| appeal; and/or | , | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | |
| The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, t | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [| will not be entered, or b) will will will will will will will | I be entered and an e | xplanation of |
| how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | i bo ontoroa ana an o | apianation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-16.18-20 and 27-38. | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | sufficient reasons why the affidavi | it or other evidence is | necessary and |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fail: | s to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. ☐ Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). | | |
| o oaton | | | |
| | /Daniel S. Metzmaier/ | | |

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Reasons of record. Since applicants do not define what is meant by "fully water soluble" and water is defined as a liquid of claim 1, the claim is internally inconsistent. The preamble sets forth "preparing a particulate composition", while the claim sets forth contacting under high shear a staring particulate fully soluble in the contacting liquid. No reformation step exist for the particulate materials. The claims are at least incomplete since full solubility of the starting material would render the composition non-particulate.